

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are pending in the application for the Examiner's review and consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,500,137 to Bacon *et al.* ("Bacon") and U.S. Patent No. 5,942,217 to Woo *et al.* ("Woo") in view of Hodul *et al.* (Tenside, Surfactants & Detergents, 1997 – hereinafter "Hodul") or Hodul and Dharmawardana *et al.* (Langmuir, 1993 – hereinafter "Dharmawardana"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Bacon discloses low sudsing, low lathering, non-deterative fabric softening bar compositions. *See, e.g.*, Bacon, col. 2, lines 47-52. The bars of Bacon preferably do not contain deterative surfactants, including anionic surfactants. *See, e.g.*, Bacon, col. 3, lines 22-26. From about 40% to about 90% of the composition comprises fabric softening compounds. *See, e.g.*, Bacon, col. 2, lines 53-63.

Woo discloses odor-absorbing compositions for use on surfaces such as household upholsteries, drapes, carpets, car interiors and the like, as well as human and animal surfaces. *See, e.g.*, Woo, col. 1, lines 31-45. Cyclodextrin-compatible surfactants of Woo include anionic surfactants. *See, e.g.*, Woo, col. 11, lines 43-45. Aqueous solutions are preferred for odor control, as they provide maximum separation of the cyclodextrins. *See, e.g.*, Woo, col. 20, lines 6-10.

On pages 3-5 of the Office Action, it alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to add uncomplexed cyclodextrin of Woo in the fabric softening composition of Bacon because Woo teaches cyclodextrin acts as an odor absorbing molecule for a broad spectrum of organic odoriferous compounds and restores/maintains the freshness of the fabrics". *See*, Office Action, page 4, lines 3-7. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the disclosures of Bacon and Woo. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Bacon teaches away from the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that there is no motivation to combine the disclosures of Bacon and Woo. Bacon discloses a low sudsing, low lathering, non-deterative fabric softening bar

composition. The compositions of Bacon preferably do not contain deterative surfactants, including anionic surfactants. Woo, however, discloses compositions containing optional surfactants, including anionic surfactant that Bacon preferably does not contain. Further Bacon discloses compositions in the form of a bar, such a bar being used after the rinse step of fabric laundering. Woo, however, discloses aqueous solutions that can be used on inanimate surfaces including household upholsteries, drapes, carpets, car interiors and the like, as well as human and animal surfaces. These problems are not cured by Hodul and/or Dharmawardana, as they primarily discuss properties of cyclodextrins and surfactants. Because of these differences, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine the disclosure of Bacon with that of Woo to make the present invention.

Applicants further submit that the references teach away from the present invention. Bacon discloses a low sudsing, low lathering, non-deterative fabric softening bar composition. The compositions of Bacon preferably do not contain deterative surfactants, including anionic surfactants. The present invention discloses containing optional surfactants, including anionic surfactants that Bacon preferably does not contain. *See, e.g.*, Specification, pages 7-18. Also, Bacon teaches fabric softening bar compositions. The present invention discloses water as an optional carrier. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 18, lines 20-30. Further, the present inventions teaches embodiments that can be used on carpets countertops, dishes, floors, garbage cans, ceilings walls, and animate surfaces, which Bacon does not disclose or even suggest. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 1, lines 15-20. Because of the incompatibilities of the teachings of Bacon and the present invention, Applicants respectfully submit that Bacon teaches away from the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the above-cited references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-cited references teach away from the claimed invention. Thus, the above-cited references do not disclose or suggest every limitation of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With regard to all claims not specifically mentioned, these are believed to be allowable not only in view of their dependency on their respective base claims and any intervening claims, but also for the totality of features recited therein.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants to arrange for a telephonic interview in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due for the amendments herein. Should any fee be required, please charge such fee to Procter & Gamble Deposit Account No. 16-2480.

Respectfully submitted,

By Mark A. Charles

Mark A. Charles

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 51,547

Tel. No. (513) 627-4229

Dated: September 8, 2003

Customer Number: 27752

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 09 2003

OFFICIAL